Thompson Coburn

Thompson Coburn LLP Attorneys at Law

One US Bank Plaza

St. Louis, Missouri 63101-1693

314-552-6000

FAX 314-552-7000

www.thompsoncoburn.com

Facsimile

FOR IMMEDIATE DELIVERY

То	Firm Name	Phone	Fax
Examiner Robert W. Morgan	U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	(703) 305-9643	(703) 746-5583
Group Art Unit 3626			

From:	R.	Ha	fe	k	am	Į

Date: 12/21/2002

Message:

Mr. Morgan,
Here is the agenda - I look forward
your plane cull at 3 pm your-time

Atty/Client/Matter No.;

3061/51017/06592

Total Number of Pages, including this page:

If you do not receive all of the pages, please call 314-552-6272 as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Fax Department - Operator; __ Time of Transmittal: ______ A.M./P.M.

Confidentiality Note

The information contained in this facsimile transmission is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this transmission is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by collect telephone call and return the original transmission to us at the above address by U.S. mail. Thank you.

To: Examiners Robert W. Morgan and Joseph Thomas, SPE Group Art Unit 3626

Re: Patent Application serial no. 09/694,050 filed October 20, 2000

Agenda for Telephonic interview December 23, 2002

- I. Brandt teaches an internet portal to a single application software. Brandt also teaches that this single application software may be a vehicle rental software program. But, Brandt fails to teach, as claimed, a second, management software for managing the authorizing, processing and billing of the reservations as communicated to one of a plurality of service providers each having its own application software.
- A. Brandt, col. 3, lines 15-47 is the SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION and explains what Brandt discloses. More particularly, lines 25-47. Brandt discloses a system and method for providing a user access to application software over the WWW. Flowmark software is merely an example of such an application software, and it is used to illustrate a car rental embodiment where it processes car rental transactions. This further explained in the specification. See col. 10, lines 17 et seq., for example. At line 17, "Referring now to FIG. 4, a system 400 allows accessing a FlowMark workflow system over the WWW from web browser 212."
- B. Brandt, col. 14, line 23 to line 51, explaining Fig. 7 exemplify the teaching for a user to access a second rental car provider. The FlowMark application is not taught or suggested as being capable of handling reservations for multiple providers. Note that a user at CW1-3 (client workstations 1-3) have access through WS1-2 (web servers 1-2) to GCS1 (gateway computer system 1) which then provides access to SACS1 (software application system 1). Thus, Brandt et al's architecture is such that customers are funneled into a common gateway for each service provider and must access a separate gateway over the WWW to gain access to a second service provider. Typically this is done by entering another URL into a web browser.
- C. The sentence at col. 14, line 53, referenced by the Office as evidence that the FlowMark application may be used to access a car rental agency, merely identifies the FlowMark application as one that can be used by a car rental agency. This sentence, inartfully expressed, merely says that the preferred embodiment can be described in greater detail by the example of a user accessing over the WWW the application software of a car rental agency, which may itself be a FlowMark software program. It does NOT mean to suggest that the FlowMark software itself can be used to route a user to another service provider. Continuing to the read the text after this sentence demonstrates this meaning is correct. For example, see col. 15, line 22 et seq. which describes a user accessing the web by using his web browser, entering the URL for a car rental agency, and then entering data for the rental transaction. Web server application 222 then translates the data

for action by the FlowMark application. The actual xecution of the FlowMark application is then described for several columns of text. But, the FlowMark application is resident at the car rental agencies web site and the transaction is described as a single transaction for the contacted car agency.

Nowhere in any of the figures or text is there any other disclosure or suggestion of the FlowMark application transmitting the reservation to any other web site or service provider, and instead other text and figures disclose a different arrangement. See I.B. above. Nor is there any disclosed capability for a FlowMark application to provide such a connection. For example the Office comments that the FlowMark software may be used to access other rental car agencies over the WWW. There is no such disclosure or description found in Brandt, other than this one sentence, which if interpreted properly and consistently with the balance of Brandt does not so suggest an internet capability.

- II. Adding management capabilities to Brandt et al fails to form the claimed combination of two different software programs, one of which has "means for managing" the transaction while the other has means for "filling said reservation".
- III. The newly cited "Cendent Real Estate" reference does not in combination with the Brandt et al reference teach the claimed combination. Cendent relied on for teaching a system for providing direct links to multiple providers located at different web sites.
- A. Cendent apparently teaches providing a "hyperlink" which, if "clicked", will take the user's web browser over to another web site. Such a routing will merely move the user over to another web site, and no rental transaction data will be available to the first program at the first web site to be "managed". In other words, the connection is not "through" the first web site, but instead "re-established" at a second web site. So, even if the application software (FlowMark software for example) had management capability, it would have no data to manage as the data would be entered directly into the application software found at the second web site.
- IV. Suggestions to amend the claims presently pending in order to obtain an allowance of some, at least, even presuming continued disagreement over the interpretation of Brandt et al.
- A. Limit the claims to accessing both software programs through a single web site address.
- B. Limit the claims to management software for processing third party reservations.
- C. Limit the claims to management software for handling high volume of reservations from each of one or more users.
- V. The incredible commercial success of the invention, used to process rental vehicle transactions generating literally hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue annually, by the largest rental car company in the world, rebuts any pr sumption of obviousness.